87-22 (1)

NO.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

OCTOBER TERM, 1986

EDDIE OSBORNE,

PETITIONER

Vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

RESPONDENT

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TOMMY H. JAGENDORF, Counsel of Record
5248 Pelham Circle
Memphis, Tennessee, 38119
(901)-685-5061

Attorney for Petitioner, Eddie Osborne

44 pp

A. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

(1) Whether the recordings of telephone conversations made by certain defendants in the case before this Court were inadmissible because the Federal Wiretap Act, Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. &2510, et seq (1982), bans the use of the fruits of interceptions made for the purpose of committing a criminal act?

(2) Whether the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit erred in construing the Act in that the statutes in issue are clear and unambiguous on their face and accordingly should be carried into effect as congress has enacted them without considering other rules of construction to determine the legislative intent?

B. PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

W. Hickman Ewing and Frederick H. Godwin, United States Attorney and Assistant United States Attorney, represented the United States of America before the District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Western Division. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Godwin also represented the Government before the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

At the District Court level, Tommy H. Jagendorf served as defense counsel for Defendants Eddie Osborne and Joe Osborne. Mr. Jagendorf represented the Osbornes through the appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

At the District Court level and on appeal, Robert M. Friedman represented Defendant, Walter Person.

At the District Court level and on appeal, Stephen Butler and Albert Boyd represented Defendant, Howard "Ace" Underhill.

At the District Court level and on appeal, Frank Holloman represented Defendant, Pat Tata.

At the District Court level and on appeal, James D. Causey represented Defendant, Tony Rayburn.

John P. Colton, Jr. represented Defendant, Daniel Rokitka.

C. TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(1) TABLE OF CONTENTS

(2) TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

RULES

STATUTES

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

D. REFERENCE TO THE OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS OF OPINIONS DELIVERED IN THE COURTS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has been recommended for full text publication. A copy of the unpublished Opinion is included in the Appendix, separately presented.

E. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

(1) The judgment sought to be reviewed was decided and filed March 6, 1987,

(2) The Defendant did not file a Petition for Rehearing En Banc nor has Defendant petitioned for an extension of time within which to file his Petition for Certiorari.

(3) The Petitioner anticipates no cross-petition for certiorari; however, the Petitioner anticipates that one or more of the Defendants in the consolidated appeal will petition for certiorari.

(4) The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. &1254.

F. RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

(1) Rule 901 of the Federal Rules of Evidence

(2) Rule 1002 of the Federal Rules of Evidence

(3) 18 U.S.C. &2

(4) 18 U.S.C. &371

(5) 18 U.S.C. &1084(a)

(6) 18 U.S.C. &1952(a)(1)

(7) 18 U.S.C. &1955

(8) 18 U.S.C. &2510 (Appendix B)

(9) 18 U.S.C. &2511 (Appendix C)

(10) 18 U.S.C. &2515 (Appendix D)

(11) 18 U.S.C. &2518 (Appendix E)

(12) 18 U.S.C. &2520

(13) 26 U.S.C. &7262

(14) 46 U.S.C. &596

(15) Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 39-6-601, 602, 603, 604, 607. 608, 610, 611
(Sections 39-6-601 and 39-6-602 are set forth in Appendix F and Appendix G)

G. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On November 20, 1985, the Federal Grand Jury for the Western District of Tennessee returned sixteen (16) indictments charging thirty-five (35) individuals with violations of federal gambling and narcotics laws. Among those indictments was a five-count indictment which charged Howard "Ace" Underhill, Daniel J. Rokitka, Eddie Osborne, Joe Osborne and Walter Person with violations of federal gambling laws.

Count I charged Underhill, Rokitka, the Osbornes and Person with conducting an illegal gambling business in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &1955.

Count II charged Underhill, Rokitka, the Osbornes and Person with a conspiracy to violate federal gambling laws in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &371.

Count III charged Eddie Osborne with traveling in interstate commerce with the intent to distribute the proceeds of unlawful activity in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &1952(a)(1).

Count IV charged Underhill, Rokitka and Eddie Osborne with the use of wire communication facilities in interstate commerce to transmit gambling information in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &1084(a).

Count V charged Underhill, Rokitka and the Osbornes with accepting wagers without having paid the Federal Wagering Tax in violation of Title 26 U.S.C. &7262 and Title 18 U.S.C. &2.

Also among the November 20, 1985 indictments was a three-count indictment charging Leck Fraley, Jr., Pat Tata, Michael Ezell, Tony Rayburn and Donald E. "Tapper" Swanton with violation of federal gambling laws. All five defendants were charged in Count I with conducting an illegal gambling business in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &1955 and 2.

Count II charged the Defendants with conspiracy to violate federal gambling laws in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. &371.

Count III charged the Defendants with accepting wagers without having paid the Federal Wagering Tax in violation of Title 26 U.S.C. &7262.

On February 7, 1986, District Judge Robert M. McRae, Jr. denied certain motions to suppress evidence filed by Defendants Underhill, Rokitka, Eddie Osborne and Joe Osborne. These motions concerned the execution of search warrants at an apartment leased to the Defendant Rotitka, on the persons of Rokitka and Underhill, and searches of vehicles of Rokitka and Underhill on the premises.

On February 7, 1986, Defendant, Walter Person, filed a written Motion in Limine Regarding the Suppression of Evidence to-wit Tape Recorded Communications and/or Motion to Prohibit the Use of Intercepted Tape Recorded Oral Communications Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. &2515. The attorneys for Underhill and Rokitka orally joined in this motion and were later joined by the Osbornes on March 7, 1986.

Defendant, Tony Rayburn, filed a Motion seeking to suppress the same tape recordings of February 26, 1986.

Defendant, Pat Tata, joined in this Motion on March 5, 1986.

On February 28, 1986, District Judge McRae held a single evidentiary hearing regarding these tapes. On March 6, 1986, Judge McRae ordered the tapes suppressed. The United States filed its Motion to Reconsider on March 31, 1986. On April 4, 1986, the United States filed a Notice of Appeal. Judge McRae denied the Motion to Reconsider on April 8, 1986.

The United States perfected its appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

In its Opinion dated March 6, 1987, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit reversed the judgment of the District Court.

The relevant facts underlying the indictments handed down by the Federal Grand Jury for the Western District of Tennessee are as follows:

On March 23, 1985, a federal search warrant was served at an apartment registered to Defendant, Dan Rokitka. Rokitka and Howard "Ace" Underhill were present at the time of the search. Agents seized linesheets, gambling paraphernalia, and records. Also seized were cassette tapes found in and near tape recorders hooked to the telephone in the apartment. While agents were executing the search warrants, the phones in the apartment continued to ring. Agents answering the phones found the calls were for the purpose of placing bets. Agents who executed the search turned the seized evidence over to Special Agent Richard Gray of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Gray reviewed the evidence. Gray testified at the suppression hearing.

In Gray's opinion, a bookmaking operation was being carried out at Rokitka's apartment.

Special Agent Gray listened to fifteen (15) tapes seized at Rokitka's apartment. The

subject matter of the tapes was the exchange of gambling information. Gray determined, from listening to the tapes, that the phones were manned by Dan Rokitka and Howard "Ace" Underhill. In one of the recorded conversations between Underhill and Jane Egan, the parties to the conversation discussed problems with certain bettors who, upon losing a bet, would claim they had bet less than they had.[1]

Underhill told Egan that he started recording all of his bets. Special Agent Gray testified that he interviewed Dan Rokitka in the presence of his attorney and Rokitka stated that the purpose of the recordings was to record bets. Gray recalled an incident recorded on

---

[1] Jane Egan is a defendant in United States vs. Bill Harlow and Jane Egan, 85-2023-G in the Western District of Tennessee. That indictment also charged violations of federal gambling laws. Ms. Egan filed a Motion to Suppress the same tapes before District Judge Julia S. Gibbons. Her motion as well as the motion of the co-defendant, Bill Harlow, was based on the same theory as the Defendants in the case before this Court argued. Judge Gibbons denied Ms.Egan's motion.

one tape where a caller had a disagreement about a wager. Rokitka played the tape of the bet back. Playing back the tape apparently ended the disagreement.

The tapes in question contained conversations between Underhill and Rokitka and Defendants, Walter Person, Eddie Osborne, Joe Osborne, Pat Tata and Tony Rayburn. The conversations involved the exchange of gambling information and the placing of wagers. All tapes contained either Rokitka or Underhill as a party to the conversation.

H. ARGUMENT

According to Rule 17 of the Rules of the United States Supreme Court, the following list indicates the character of reasons that will be considered in granting a review on certiorari:

> (a) When a federal court of appeals has rendered a decision in conflict with the decision of another federal court of appeals on the same matter; or has decided a federal question in a way in conflict with a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or so far sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's power of supervision.
>
> (b) When a state court of last resort has decided a federal question in a way in conflict with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a federal court of appeals.
>
> (c) When a state court or a federal court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law which has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided a federal question in a way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court.

Petitioner, Eddie Osborne respectfully insists that the case before this Court satisfies the requirements of subsections (a) and

(c) of Rule 17.

In its decision dated March 6, 1987, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit addressed the question of "whether the participants in an illegal gambling business, some of whom caused their recorded telephone conversations to be intercepted and recorded, are entitled to have these recordings suppressed during a prosecution for violation of federal anti-gambling statutes."

The answer hinged on the Court's construction of various provisions of the Federal Wiretap Act, Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. &2510, et seq. (1982) (hereinafter referred to as "Title III" or the "Act")

The Court of Appeals quoted the exclusionary provision of the Act contained at 18 U.S.C. &2515:

> Whenever any wire or oral communication has been intercepted, no part of the contents of such communication and no evidence derived therefrom may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any

> court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State or a political subdivision thereof if the disclosure of that information would be in violation of this chapter.

The Court of Appeals determined that &2515 is not self executing. An aggrieved person may move to suppress the contents of an intercepted communication pursuant to 18 U.S.C. &2518(10)(a) (i). Section 2510(11) defines an aggrieved person as one "who was a party to any intercepted wire or oral communication or a person against 'whom the interception was directed.

As the Court noted, &2511(1)(a) prohibits all willful interceptions of wire and oral communications unless a specific section of the statutes excepts a particular interception. Section 2511(1)(c) prohibits willful disclosure of the contents of communications by a person who knows or has reason to know that information was obtained through an unlawful interception.

Section 2511(2) lists the exceptions to the general proscription against interceptions.

The Defendants contended before the Sixth Circuit that the only exception which could render the tapes legal did not apply because of the purpose for which Defendants Rokitka and Underhill made the tapes. Specifically, the Defendants referred to 18 U.S.C. &2511(2)(d):

> It shall not be unlawful under this chapter for a person not acting under color of law to intercept a wire or oral communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortious act in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State or for the purpose of committing any other injurious act.

The District Court found the language of this statute clear and unambiguous and, therefore, felt compelled to comply with its command. The Court of Appeals, however, reached beyond the plain language of this statute to achieve a different result.

The Court of Appeals acknowledged that

the precise question presented in this case has not been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States or another Court of Appeals. The provisions of the Act under review, however, have been considered in other settings.

In deciding the case, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit employed the following analysis. According to the Court of Appeals, the primary purpose of the Omnibus Crime Control Act is to provide a more effective means for combating organized crime in the United States. The second purpose of the Act is to prohibit all other interceptions and disclosures of wire and oral communications unless specifically authorized by provisions of the Act. (Op. at 8-9). The Court determined that since the interceptions in question were made by private individuals not acting under any color of law, Section 2511(2)(d) is the only exception arguably applicable.

The Court of Appeals concluded that the legality of an interception is determined by the purpose for which the interception is made, not

by the subject of the communication intercepted. Citing United States v. Truglio, 731 F.2d 1123, 1131 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 105 S.Ct. 197 (1984) The Court observed that generally when the purpose of an interception is to make an accurate record of a conversation with the intention of preventing future distortions by a participant, the interception is legal. Citing,By-Prod Corp. v. Armen-Berry Co., 668 F.2d 956, 959 (7th Cir. 1982); United States v. Phillips, 564 F.2d 32, 33 (8th Cir. 1977).

According to the Court of Appeals' Opinion at pages 9 and 10, Underhill and Rokitka testified that the purpose of taping the conversations was to make a record to settle any future disputes about the terms of betting transactions. The Court's statement is not accurate. Underhill and Rokitka did not testify at the suppression hearing. Rather, Agent Gray testified about his conversations with Underhill and Rokitka.

The Court further addressed the issue of whether the interceptions were made " for the

purpose of committing any criminal . . . act" under the laws of the State of Tennessee. The Court of Appeals stated that the recording was not an element of the criminal transaction of making and accepting bets. The transactions were unlawful in and of themselves. The recordings added nothing. The Court noted, however, that the taping of the conversations did make a gambling record as defined in Tennessee Code Annotated &39-6-601(7) and T.C.A. &39-6-602(e). T.C.A. &39-6-602(e) makes it a misdemeanor to knowingly make, possess or store a gambling record. The Court of Appeals concluded that the communications were intercepted for the purpose of committing a criminal act.

The Court did not end its inquiry, however. The Court further addressed the issue of whether the exclusionary rule contained in &2515 applied to the circumstances of this case.

In its analysis of this issue, the Court of Appeals addressed the appropriate standard to be used in construing statutes.

The Court recognized the general rule

that when the intent of Congress is expressed in plain terms the Court must treat that language as conclusive. Citing, Griffin v. Oceanic Contractors, Inc., 458 U. S. 564, 570 (1982). The Court of Appeals strayed, however, from the general rule, relying upon the case of United States v. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 310 U.S. 534, 542-544 (1940).

The Court of Appeals acknowledged that the Supreme Court in Gelbard v. United States, 408 U.S. 41, 48 (1972), described the protection of privacy as the overriding congressional concern behind enactment of Title III. The Sixth Circuit stated that the Act provided protection to the victims of unlawful interceptions, not to the perpetrator. The Court of Appeals concluded:

> We think it is clear that Congress did not intend for &2515 to shield the very people who committed the wrongful interceptions from the consequences of their wrongdoing. Underhill and Rokitka waived their right of privacy in these communications by their deliberate act of causing them to be recorded. If the language of &2511(2)(d) and &2515 were applied literally to Underhill and Rokitka it would produce an absurd result that we are confident Congress did not intend.

The Court of Appeals rejected Defendant Person's argument that he did not consent to the interception of his conversations and, therefore, was entitled to suppress the tapes containing his conversations. According to the Court of Appeals, if Person had been a mere customer of a gambling establishment, this argument would have merit. Since Person was a confederate of Underhill and Rokitka, the Court ruled that he waived his right of privacy in the conversations. Because all of the Appellees were charged with conspiracy, the Court held the individual defendants bound by the acts of the co-conspirators. Citing, Pinkerton v. United States, 328 U.S. 640, 646-648 (1946); United V. Bowers, 739 F.2d 1050, 1052 (6th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom., Oakes v. United States, 469 U.S. 861 (1984).

For the following reasons, Defendant, Eddie Osborne, respectfully insists that the Court of Appeals was in error in reversing the judgment of the District Court.

(1) Recordings of telephone conversations made by certain Defendants were inadmissible

because the Federal Wiretap Act bans the use of the fruits of interceptions made for the purpose of committing a criminal act.

Defendant, Eddie Osborne, insists that the tapes seized by the Government in the case before this Court do not meet the requirements of Rule 901 and Rule 1002 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Moreover, Defendant Eddie Osborne insists that the information contained therein was obtained in violation of 18 U.S.C. &2510, et seq.

In 1968, Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, 18 U.S.C. &2510, et seq. Sections 2511(2)(d), 2515 and 2518(10)(a) apply to the case before this Court.

18 U.S.C. &2511(2)(d) provides as follows:

> It shall not be unlawful under this chapter for a person not acting under color of law to intercept a wire or oral communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortious act in violation of the

Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State or for the purpose of committing any other injurious act.

18 U.S.C. &2515 provides as follows:

Whenever any wire or oral communication has been intercepted, no part of the contents of such communication and no evidence derived therefrom may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof if the disclosure of that information would be in violation of this chapter.

18 U.S.C. &2518(10)(a) provides as follows:

Any aggrieved person in any trial, hearing, or proceeding in or before any court, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, or other authority of the United States, a State,or a political subdivision thereof, may move to suppress the contents of any wire or oral communication intercepted pursuant to this chapter, or evidence derived therefrom, on the ground that -

(i) the communication was unlawfully intercepted;

(ii) the order of authorization or approval under which it was intercepted

is insufficient on its face; or

(iii) the interception was not made in conformity with the order of authorization or approval.

Such motion shall be made before the trial, hearing, or proceeding unless there was no opportunity to make such motion or the person was not aware of the grounds of the motion. If the motion is granted, the contents of the intercepted wire or oral communication, or evidence derived therefrom, shall be treated as having been obtained in violation of this chapter. The judge, upon the filing of such motion by the aggrieved person, may, in his discretion, make available to the aggrieved person or his counsel for inspection such portions of the interception communication or evidence derived therefrom as the judge determines to be in the interest of justice.

The indictments in the cases before this Court charged the Defendants with violating and conspiring to violate 18 U.S.C. &1955 by conducting illegal gambling businesses in violation of T.C.A. &&39-6-601, 39-6-602, 39-6-603, 39-6-604, 39-6-607, 39-6-608, 309-6-610, and 39-6-611.

Section 1955 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

Prohibition of Illegal Gambling Businesses. (a) Whoever conducts, finances, manages, supervises, directs, or owns all or part of an illegal gambling business shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) As used in this section --

(1) "Illegal gambling business" means a gambling business which - (i) is a violation of the law of this State, or a political subdivision in which it is conducted; (ii) involves five or more persons who conduct, finance, manage, supervise, direct or own all or part of such business; and (iii) has been or remains in substantial continuous operation for a period in excess of thirty days or has a gross revenue of $2,000. in any single day.

(2) "Gambling" includes but is not limited to pool-selling, bookmaking, maintaining slot machines, roulette wheels or dice tables, and conducting lotteries, policy, bolita or numbers games, or selling chances therein.

(3) "State" means any State of the United States, District of Clumbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(c) If five or more persons conduct, finance, manage, supervise, direct, or own all or part of a gambling business and such business operates for two or more successive days, then, for the purpose of obtaining warrants for arrests, interceptions, and other searches and seizures, probable cause that the business receives gross revenues

in excess of $2,000 in any single day shall be deemed to have been established.

T.C.A. 39-6-602-(e) and 39-6-603-(a) provide as follows:

> (e) Whoever knowingly prints, makes, possesses, stores, or transports any gambling record, or buys, sells, offers or solicits any interest therein, whether through an agent or employee, or otherwise, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than five hundred dollars ($500.00) and, in the discretion of the Court, imprisoned in the county jail or workhouse for a period of time not more than six (6) months, and in the enforcement of this subsection, direct possession of any gambling records shall be presumed to be knowing possession thereof.
>
> . . .
>
> (a) Whoever knowingly transmits or receives gambling information by telephone, telegraph, radio, semaphore, or similar means, or knowingly installs or maintains equipment for the transmission or receipt of gambling information, shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars ($1,000), or imprisoned not more than one (1) year, or both.

Judge McRae found that Rokitka and Underhill made the tapes for the purpose of recording bets; therefore, these Defendants made the

tapes for the purpose of committing a criminal act under the laws of the State of Tennessee regarding gambling, gambling records, and transmitting gambling information. Judge McRae ordered the tapes suppressed under &2515. Defendant Eddie Osborne respectfully insists that Judge McRae correctly interpreted and applied &&2511(2)(d) and 2515 according to the plain meaning of the statutory language.

The Court of Appeals acknowledged the general rule that the plain language of a statute ordinarily defines the purpose of the legislation. Citing, Griffin v. Oceanic Contractors, Inc., 458 U.S. 564 (1982). The Court of Appeals argued that a plain reading of &&2511(2)(d) and 2515 led to an absurd result. The Court cited United States v. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 310 U.S. 534 (1940) in support of this proposition.

In the American Trucking case, the Supreme Court considered whether the Interstate Commerce Commission's power under the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 to establish reasonable

requirements with respect to the qualifications of maximum hours of service of employees of motor carriers extended to employees other than those whose duties affected safety of operation. Id. at 538. The Court restricted the meaning of employees to those employees whose activities affected the safety of operation. Id. at 553.

In the Griffin case, in contrast, the Court literally applied the statute in question. The Griffin case concerned the application of 46 U.S.C. &596, repealed Aug. 8, 1983, which required vessel owners and masters to promptly pay seamen after their discharge from service. Section 596 further authorized seamen to recover double wages for each day payment was delayed without sufficient cause. The Supreme Court addressed the issue of whether district courts may, in their discretion, limit the period during which wage penalty accrues or whether imposition of the penalty for each day of delay is mandatory. Id.at 565-566. The Court held that the plain meaning of &596 left no room for

discretion in deciding whether to exact payment or in choosing the time period for calculating payment. Id. at 570. The Court stated:

> "Our task is to give effect to the will of Congress, and where its will has been expressed in reasonably plain terms, 'that language must ordinarily be regarded as conclusive'" Consumer Product Safety Comm'n v. G.T.E. Sylvania, Inc., 447 U.S. 102, 108 (1980).

Id. at 570.

In the Griffin case, Oceanic Contractors, Inc. argued that a literal interpretation of &596 would produce an absurd result. The Court recognized that interpretations which would produce absurd results are to be avoided if alternative interpretations are consistent with the legislative purpose. Id.at 575 (citing, United States V. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 310 U.S. 542-543; Haggar v. Helvering, 308 U.S. 389, 394 (1940). The Court refused to nullify &596 however hard or unexpected its effects:

> Laws enacted with good inten-

> tion, when put to the test, frequently, and to the surprise of the lawmaker himself, turn out to be mischievious, absurd or otherwise objectionable. But in such case the remedy lies with the lawmaking authority, and not with the Courts. Crooks vs. Harrelson, 282 U.S. 55, 60 (1930).

Id. at 575

The Defendant would assert that the statutes in dispute in the present case are clear and unambiguous. The legislative intent can clearly be determined from the language of the statute itself. The tapes produced were indisputably the result of an interception in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 2511(2)(d). The contents of the said tapes were prohibited from being disclosed under Section 2511(1)(c). Therefore, the contents of the tapes should be suppressed from evidence at trial pursuant to Section 2515. As Congress explicitly created no exceptions, other than those statutorily set out in Title III, it would not be correct for the Court to adopt an interpretation which would tend to create such an overreaching exception. As the Court in Sandoz Works, Inc. v. United States, 50 C.C.P.A. 31 (1963) stated:

> It was within the province of Congress to restrict, qualify or impose conditional facets relating to the purpose and scope of the statute, and where it did not see fit to do so, a Court will not amend or read into a statute by construction that which is not there. Id at 34.

The Defendant would assert that the statutes in dispute are so clear and unambiguous on their face that the court need not look to other rules of construction to determine the congressional intent. However, for the sake of argument, if one did consider the legislative history of Title 18 United States Code Sections 2510-2515 one would find that the legislative history also supports the trial court's interpretation of the statute.

As one reviews the legislative history of the Code provisions of Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 2510 et. seq., one finds that the main purpose of the enactment was to protect the privacy of wire and oral communications. More specifically, the purpose was to prevent the improper interception of communications and to protect such intercepted communications from disclosure

when possible. This overriding purpose of the statute is set out in the Congressional Findings of Section 801 of Pub. L. 90-351 which provides:

> .. The contents of these communications and evidence derived therefrom are being used by public and private parties as evidence in court and administrative proceedings and by persons whose activities affect interstate commerce....
>
> (b) In order to protect effectively the privacy of wire and oral communications, to protect the integrity of court and administrative proceedings, and to prevent the obstruction of interstate commerce, it is necessary for Congress to define on a uniform basis the circumstances and conditions under which the interception of wire and oral communications may be authorized, to prohibit any unauthorized interceptions of such communications, and the use of the contents thereof in evidence in courts and administrative proceedings.

It is important to note from the above excerpt that it was Congress' responsibility to specifically set out the circumstances in which unauthorized communications were to be suppressed from evidence in the Courts. In turn, Congress elected to enact 18 U.S.C. 2515 which would exclude all improper interceptions of communications.

The Government seeks to have this court overlook the clear and unequivocal language of the statutes claiming that to implement the statutes as Congress has enacted them would produce absurd results. The Government in attempting to demonstrate the possibility of absurd results cites a possible difficulty prosecuting one accused of illegally intercepting communications. The Government claims that a tape could not be mentioned or entered into evidence in any way. However, the Defendants would assert that no such absurd results would occur when the statutes are implemented as enacted. The statute does not prohibit the introduction into evidence of a tape of illegally intercepted communications. Rather, the statute only restricts the disclosure of the contents of the tape.

The actual tape may be brought into evidence to show that a recording had been made. Other evidence could thereafter be presented from other sources to show that the tapes had been used to illegally intercept communications. In a case involving an

individual who is being tried for illegally intercepting communications on tape, the government should be able to build its case without having to disclose the actual contents of the tape. Congress concluded that to the extent the exclusion of the contents of the tape makes the government's task of prosecution more difficult, this difficulty was outweighed by the concern that society's right to privacy be protected.

Therefore, Congress did not find it absurd to suppress all illegal communications, even the Defendant's in the present case, in an effort to protect society's right to privacy as a whole. There is no way that an illegal interception may be brought into evidence against the Defendant in this case without disclosing conversations with individuals who were unaware that the conversations were being recorded. Furthermore, should a court allow the contents of the tapes in the present case into evidence, it would be in effect becoming a partner with the interceptors in illegal conduct.

Consequently, when one looks at the legislative intent behind the enactment of the statutes in issue in this case, one can see why Congress drafted the statutes so broadly as to exclude the contents of any improper interceptions in all court proceedings. Accordingly, the Defendant would assert that the legislative history also supports the trial court's interpretation of the statutes in issue.

I. CONCLUSION

Title 18 United States Code Sections 2510 et. seq., being duly enacted by Congress, clearly and unequivocally requires that the tapes in the present case should be suppressed. The Government does not even dispute that the plain reading of the statutes would require suppression. Yet, the Government seeks to ask this court to adopt an exception to this statute which would be in direct opposition to the language of the statutes. Even more disturbing, the Government requests this strained interpretation in order to pursue criminal sanctions against the Defendant.

For this reason, and for the foregoing reasons, Defendant, Eddie Osborne respectfully requests this Court to grant his petition in this cause for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to hear and decide his case on oral argument and briefs.

Respectfully submitted,

TOMMY H. JAGENDORF
Attorney for Petitioner
5248 Pelham Circle
Memphis, Tennessee 38119
(901)-685-5061

May 1, 1987

J. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Tommy H. Jagendorf, Attorney for Petitioner, hereby certify that I have this 1st day of May, 1987, pursuant to Rule 28 of the Supreme Court Rules, caused to be served upon the Honorabl W. Hickman Ewing, United States Attorney, Federal Building, Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Mr. Frederick H. Godwin, Assistant United States Attorney, Federal Building, Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, Mr. Albert Boyd, Attorney-At-Law, 424 N. McNeil, Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Mr. Robert Friedman, Attorney-At-Law, Suite 3010, 100 North Main Bldg., Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Mr. James D. Causey, Attorney-at-Law, 208 Adams Ave., Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Mr. Steve Butler, Attorney-At-Law, 22 N. Front Street, Suite 1020, Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, Mr. John P. Carlton, Attorney-At-Law, 629 Poplar Avenue, Memphis,

Tennessee, 38105, and Mr. Frank Holloman, Attorney-At-Law, 240 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee, 38103, copies of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed by Eddie Osborne, by placing copies of same in the United States Mail, properly addressed, and with sufficient postage affixed thereto.

Tommy H. Jagendorf